



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,846	12/22/2000	Richard P. Modelski	P 270184 NOR-13176BA	8545

7590 07/30/2003

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP
Intellectual Property Group
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

THAI, XUAN MARIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003



Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,846

Applicant(s)

MODELSKI ET AL.

Examiner

XUAN M. THAI

Art Unit

2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4 and 6-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to communications filed on December 22, 2000. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

Double Patenting

2. Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 16. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

3. Applicant is advised that should claim 16 be found allowable, claim 17 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2181

5. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Tagged Inter Processor Communication Bus for Multiprocessor Systems” disclosed in the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, August 1991 (hereinafter will be referenced as **Tagged**).

As per claim 1, **Tagged** reference discloses a method for transferring data comprising: providing a master request bus (master a bus request line; page 116, paragraph 8; fig. 1); providing a slave request bus (e.g. slave bus request line in D-bus; see page 116, paragraph 5; fig. 1); initiating an operation utilizing a protocol when a master request and an arbiter grant is received from the master request bus -- would be within the teachings of **Tagged** wherein **Tagged** states that:

“A central arbitration scheme is used to grant access to either the A-bus, D-bus or both. A processor wanting to perform an IPC bus read cycle issues an A-bus read request, drives its requesting address and unique requester identifier (APID) when granted the bus, and then waits for a reply on the D-bus. Replies to read requests return on a subsequent D-bus cycle, tagged with the requester's unique processor-id on the DPID lines. That is, during the corresponding D-bus cycle, the DPID will contain the unique processor ID placed on the APID by the requester when the read request was issued. Similarly, a processor wanting to perform an IPC bus write cycle issues an A-bus write cycle request to the central arbiter, and then drives the appropriate buses when granted.” (page 116, para. 4).

wherein the protocol enables transfer of data between computer hardware (e.g. buses, processors and memories et cet.) operating according to different protocols – would be within teachings of **Tagged** since **Tagged** discloses master protocol and slave protocol.

As per claim 5, **Tagged** discloses a global access bus for transferring data, said global access bus comprising; a master request bus (e.g. master request bus lines of A-bus and D-bus, (W) request line); and a slave request bus (D-bus request line) operationally connected to said master request bus (e.g. D-bus request line); wherein said master request bus and said slave request bus utilize a protocol enabling transfer of data between computer hardware (e.g.

processors – master; and memory – slave) operating according to different protocols (master device protocol and slave device protocol) [e.g. see pages 116-117; fig. 1].

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-4, 6-16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references are cited in the Form PTO-892 for the applicant's review.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xuan M. Thai whose telephone number is (703) 308-2064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached on (703) 305-4815.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	[After Final Communication]
(703) 746-7239	[Official Communication]
(703) 746-7240	[For Status inquiries and draft communication]

Art Unit: 2181

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Xuan M. Thai', is centered on the page.

XUAN M. THAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

XMT
July 28, 2003